

11 as more clearly defined, and the language "each separation step" in Claim 13, distinguishes Applicant's claimed invention from the cited prior art.

In the office action, the Examiner (1) stated that the amendment to the specification overcame the drawing objections; (2) rejected Claims 6-10 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph; (3) rejected Claims 5 and 7-12 under 35 USC § 102(b); and (4) rejected Claim 6 under 35 USC § 103(a).

Applicant is submitting in this response: (1) amendment of Claims 5, 7, 10, and 11; (2) cancellation of Claims 6, 8, and 9; (3) new Claim 13; and (4) arguments regarding the 102(b) rejection.

Accordingly, please amend the above entitled application as follows:

**In The Claims**

Please enter amended Claims 5, 7, 10, and 11 as presented on Attachment A. Please enter Claims 13 which is rewritten formerly dependant Claims 8, now presented in independent form. Please cancel Claims 6, 8, and 9.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to Claims 5 and 11 simply narrow the scope of the claims so that the amendments do not require a further search, nor would the amendments raise the issue of new matter.